RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 0 7 2006

I hereby certify that this document is being transmitted by facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office at (571) 273-8300 on the date shown below.
Date of Transmission: Feb. 7, 2006
Typed or printed name: Jack H. McKinney
Signature: _____

PATENT APPLICATION
DOCKET NO. 10013819-1

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

INVENTOR(S): Gregory Eugene Perkins, et al.

SERIAL NO.: 10/085,679 **GROUP ART UNIT:** 2141

FILED: February 27, 2002 **EXAMINER:** Patel, Chirag R.

SUBJECT: **SESSION COORDINATION**

U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Applicants request review of the final rejection in the above identified application. No amendments are filed with this request. This request is filed with the Notice of Appeal.

REMARKS SUPPORTING REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Claims 1-30 are pending and stand rejected under Section 102 as being anticipated by US Pub. 2002/0128925 to Angeles.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for coordinating sessions and recites the following acts:

1. providing, from a second server, a second session interface to a client, the second session interface having instructions to send second association data to a third server; and
2. communicating, from the second server, with the third server to identify activity related to a first session interface utilizing the association data, the first session interface having been previously provided to the client from a first server.

Rejecting Claim 1, the Examiner quotes the claim and then makes the following mysterious statement:

> ([0011] - tracking and reporting online activity across a plurality of clients and servers, [0032] - supports multiple session interfaces, [0033], [0034] - identify activity related to the session interface, [0079] - reporting modules)

Nothing in the cited paragraphs or elsewhere in Angeles mention or suggests providing, from a second server, a second session interface to a client where the second session interface has instructions to send second association data to a third server. Nothing in the cited paragraphs or elsewhere in Angeles mention or suggests communicating, from the second server, with the third server to identify activity related to a first session interface utilizing the association data, the first session interface having been previously provided to the client from a first server.

For at least these reasons, Claim, 1 is patentable over Angeles as are Claims 2-4 which depend from Claim 1

Claim 5 is directed to a method for coordinating sessions. Like Claim 1, Claim 5 recites, among other acts, (1) providing, from a second server, a second session interface to the client, the second session interface having instructions to send second association data

to the third server, and (2) communicating, from the second server, with the third server utilizing the first and second association data to identify activity related to the first session interface.

As above with respect to claim 1, Angeles does not teach or suggest providing, from a second server, a second session interface to a client where the second session interface has instructions to send second association data to a third server. Nothing in the cited paragraphs or elsewhere in Angeles mention or suggests communicating, from the second server, with the third server to identify activity related to a first session interface utilizing the association data, the first session interface having been previously provided to the client from a first server. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable over Angeles, so are Claim 5 and Claims 6-11 which depend from Claim 5.

Claim 5 further recites providing, from a first server, a first session interface to a client, the first session interface having instructions to send first association data to the third server. Angeles describes a system for capturing transmissions between a single client and a single server for the purpose of reporting online activity. Angeles, paragraph [0035]. In doing so, Angeles employs an URL proxy that rewrites URLs so that the original URL is encoded as part of the rewritten proxy URL. Angeles, paragraph [0036]. Angeles, paragraph [0037] merely describes that a request from a client to a rewritten URL is sent to an URL proxy. The URL proxy forwards the request to the original URL. The URL proxy receives responses, rewrites the URLs in those responses, and forwards the responses back to the client.

All interfaces provided to Angeles' client are provided by the URL proxy. Because each URL in each interface returned to the client has been rewritten to reference the URL proxy, none of those interfaces include instruction to send data anywhere but to the URL proxy. As a consequence, Angeles does not teach or suggest providing, from a first server, a first session interface to a client where that first session interface has instructions to send first association data to a third server. Angeles' client only receives data from and sends data to the URL proxy.

For at least these additional reasons, Claim 5 and Claims 6-11 which depend from Claim 5, are patentable over Angeles.

Claim 12 is directed to a session coordinating method. Like Claim 1, Claim 12 recites and recites the following acts:

1. providing from a first server a first web page to a client the first web page having instructions to request a web bug from a third server;
2. from the client, requesting the web bug sending a cookie and an URL for the first web page to the third server;
3. providing from a second server a second web page to a client, the second web page having instructions to request the web bug from the third server;
4. from the client, requesting the web bug sending the cookie and an URL for the second web page to the third server;
5. saving the cookie and the URL for the first web page as an entry in an association table maintained from the third server;
6. saving the cookie and the URL for the second web page as an entry in the association table;
7. from the second server, providing the URL for the second web page to the third server, querying the association table for the cookie in the entry containing the URL for the second web page;
8. from the second server, identifying other entries in the association table containing that cookie;
9. from the second server, identifying, from those entries, the entry containing the URL for the first web page; and
10. identifying activity relating to the first web page using that URL for the first web page.

As mentioned above with respect to Claim 1, Angeles mentions nothing of the direct and/or indirect use of a client, a first server, a second server, and a third server in the manner recited by 12. Angeles simply describes an URL proxy that intercepts and monitors traffic between a client and a server. Angeles mentions nothing of using a third server to coordinate a session between a client and a first server with a session between the client and a second server in the manner recited by Claim 12.

For at least these reasons, Claim 12 is patentable over Angeles.

Claim 13 is directed to a computer readable medium having instructions for implementing the method of Claim 1. For at least the same reason Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claim 13 and Claims 14-16 which depend from Claim 13.

Claim 17 is directed to a computer readable medium having instructions for implementing the method of Claim 5. For at least the same reason Claim 5 is patentable, so are Claim 17 and Claims 18-23 which depend from Claim 17.

Claim 24 is directed to a computer readable medium having instructions for implementing the method of Claim 12. For at least the same reason Claim 12 is patentable, so is Claim 24.

Claim 25 is directed to a system reciting elements for implementing the method of Claim 1. For at least the same reason Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claim 25 and Claim 26 which depends from Claim 25.

Claim 27 is directed to a system reciting elements for implementing the method of Claim 5. For at least the same reason Claim 5 is patentable, so are Claim 27 and Claim 28 which depends from Claim 27.

Claim 29 is directed to a system reciting elements for implementing the method of Claim 12. For at least the same reason Claim 12 is patentable, so is Claim 29.

Claim 30 is directed to a system reciting means for implementing the method of Claim 1. For at least the same reason Claim 1 is patentable, so is Claim 30.

Conclusion: The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action. Claims 1-30 are all felt to be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
Gregory Eugene Perkins.

By _____
Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

February 7, 2006